

Patterns of New Physics in B Decays

Maxime Imbeault,¹ David London,¹ Chandradew Sharma,² Nita Sinha,² and Rahul Sinha^{2,3}

¹*Physique des Particules, Université de Montréal,*

C.P. 6128, succ. centre-ville, Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 3J7

²*Institute of Mathematical Sciences, C. I. T Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600 113, India*

³*Theory Group, KEK, Oho 1-1 Tsukuba, 305-0801, Japan*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We show that any new physics (NP) which affects B decays with penguin contributions can be absorbed by redefinitions of the standard-model (SM) diagrammatic amplitudes. Hence, there are no clean signals of NP in such decays unless there is an accurate theoretical estimate of parameters or a justifiable approximation can be made. In all decays with penguin contributions, NP simultaneously affects pairs of diagrams. The evidence for a large C' from fits to $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data is naturally explained if NP contributes to P'_{EW} , since NP affects the P'_{EW} and C' diagrams as a pair. The weak phase γ measured in $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays will always agree with its SM value even in the presence of NP, if the NP contributes in such a way that the amplitudes retain the SM form after suitable redefinitions.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 13.20.He, 12.60.-i

It is convenient to use the diagrammatic description to compose the amplitudes for B decays. In this approach the amplitudes are written in terms of eight diagrams: the color-favored and color-suppressed tree amplitudes T and C , the gluonic penguin amplitude $\mathcal{P}$, the color-favored and color-suppressed electroweak penguin amplitudes P_{EW} and P'_{EW} , the annihilation and exchange amplitudes A and E , and the penguin-annihilation diagram PA [1]. There are also other diagrams, but they are much smaller and in general can be neglected.

The penguin diagram $\mathcal{P}_q$ for $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{q}$ transitions ($\bar{q} = \bar{s}, \bar{d}$) receives contributions from each of the internal quarks $\bar{u}$, $\bar{c}$ and $\bar{t}$ and hence does not have a single well-defined weak phase. However, using the unitarity of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix, one can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_q &= V_{ub}^* V_{uq} P_u + V_{cb}^* V_{cq} P_c + V_{tb}^* V_{tq} P_t \\ &= V_{ub}^* V_{uq} (P_u - P_c) + V_{tb}^* V_{tq} (P_t - P_c). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The phase information in the CKM matrix is conventionally parametrized in terms of the unitarity triangle, in which the interior CP-violating angles are known as α , β and γ [2]. $\mathcal{P}_q$ may be expressed in terms of these weak phases as

$$\mathcal{P}_s \equiv P'_{uc} e^{i\gamma} - P'_{tc}, \quad \mathcal{P}_d \equiv P_{uc} e^{i\gamma} + P_{tc} e^{-i\beta}, \quad (2)$$

where the negative sign of V_{ts} has been explicitly factored out. We use the convention that a prime on any diagrammatic amplitude indicates a $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}$ transition and distinguishes it from the $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{d}$ transition. PA , which contributes only to final states that are self-conjugate at the quark level, is treated similarly. Note that, technically, both P_{EW} and P'_{EW} also have two pieces. However, the u -quark pieces for these two diagrams are proportional to the u -quark mass, and are greatly suppressed. They will be neglected here. Hence all B -decay amplitudes can be written in terms of the ten diagrams T , C ,

P_{tc} , P_{uc} , P_{EW} , P'_{EW} , A , E , PA_{tc} and PA_{uc} , each of which are associated with a well-defined weak phase.

Symmetries such as isospin may be used to relate different B decay amplitudes and thus reduce the number of independent diagrammatic amplitudes. Some of the decays where this approach is particularly useful include $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $B \rightarrow \pi K$, $B \rightarrow \rho\rho$, etc. In this paper it is assumed that isospin is a good symmetry, even for any new physics (NP) beyond the standard model (SM).

We next consider the contribution of NP to these decays. There are a variety of ways of parametrizing this NP, but in the present paper we propose a diagrammatic approach which allows each diagram to be individually modified: $De^{i\phi_{SM}} \rightarrow De^{i\phi_{SM}} + NP e^{i\phi_{NP}}$. The addition of NP effects in terms of diagrams is equivalent to the inclusion of NP operators in terms of quarks [3]. Now, NP matrix elements can in general include several contributions, and may not have a well-defined weak phase. However, individual matrix elements do have well-defined phases. We therefore consider one by one the addition of these individual NP matrix elements to the diagrams.

Although our results are quite general, as an example we focus on $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays because present data are at odds with the predictions of the SM [4]. This discrepancy, often referred to as the “ $K\pi$ -puzzle,” is not yet statistically significant as it is only at the level of $2-3\sigma$. It is nevertheless intriguing since there are other disagreements in $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}$ decays. However, in this paper we do present other B -decay amplitudes to illustrate our points.

In the SM the four $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0) &= -P' + P'_{uc} e^{i\gamma}, \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) &= (P' + P'_{EW} + P'^C_{EW}) \\ &\quad - (T' + C' + P'_{uc}) e^{i\gamma}, \\ A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+) &= (P' + P'^C_{EW}) - (T' + P'_{uc}) e^{i\gamma}, \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0) &= -(P' - P'_{EW}) - (C' - P'_{uc}) e^{i\gamma}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where, in order to simplify the expressions, we have introduced $P' \equiv P'_{tc} - \frac{1}{3}P'_{EW}$ and absorbed A' into other diagrams by the redefinitions $P'_{uc} \rightarrow P'_{uc} + A'$, $T' \rightarrow T' - A'$, $C' \rightarrow C' + A'$.

We now consider the addition of NP to $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays. For example, consider first a NP contribution to the electroweak penguin: $P'_{EW} \rightarrow P'_{EW} + N'e^{i\phi}$. Note that the Lorentz structure of the NP piece is arbitrary. It has been shown that any complex number can be written in terms of two other pieces with arbitrary phases [reparametrization invariance (RI)] [5]. Since the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes involve the phases 0 and γ , we rewrite $N'e^{i\phi}$ as $N'_1 + N'_2 e^{i\gamma}$. With the addition of this NP the amplitudes become

$$\begin{aligned} A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0) &= -P' + P'_{uc} e^{i\gamma}, \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) &= (P' + P'_{EW} + P'_{EW} + N'_1) \\ &\quad - (T' + C' - N'_2 + P'_{uc}) e^{i\gamma}, \\ A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+) &= (P' + P'_{EW}) - (T' + P'_{uc}) e^{i\gamma}, \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0) &= -(P' - P'_{EW} - N'_1) \\ &\quad - (C' - N'_2 - P'_{uc}) e^{i\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

With the NP contributing to P'_{EW} , only the amplitudes $A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+)$ and $A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0)$ are affected. We can now remove N'_1 and N'_2 by making the following redefinitions: $C' \rightarrow \hat{C}' \equiv C' - N'_2$ and $P'_{EW} \rightarrow \hat{P}'_{EW} \equiv P'_{EW} + N'_1$. In this case, the above amplitudes now reduce to the *same form* as in the SM [Eq. (3)]. This has two effects. First, we see that the NP cannot be detected directly through measurements of $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays. Second, its only effect is to change the size of P'_{EW} and C' . If the NP were to contribute to $C'e^{i\gamma}$ instead of P'_{EW} , the amplitudes in the presence of this NP would again have the same form as in the SM with the redefinitions $C' \rightarrow \hat{C}' \equiv C' + N'_2$ and $P'_{EW} \rightarrow \hat{P}'_{EW} \equiv P'_{EW} - N'_1$.

If the NP is added to other diagrams, the effect is similar. In all cases the new amplitudes can be cast in the same form as that of the SM. Hence there can be *no clean signal of NP* in the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ modes. There are two cases. (i) The NP is added to T' : $T'e^{i\gamma} \rightarrow T'e^{i\gamma} + N'e^{i\phi}$. $A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+)$ and $A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+)$ are affected. One makes the redefinitions $T' \rightarrow \hat{T}' \equiv T' + N'_2$ and $P'_{EW} \rightarrow \hat{P}'_{EW} \equiv P'_{EW} - N'_1$. The situation is the same, apart from a change of relative sign in the redefinitions, if the NP is added to P'_{EW} . (ii) The NP is added to P' : $P' \rightarrow P' + N'e^{i\phi}$. Now all four amplitudes are affected. One makes the redefinitions $P' \rightarrow \hat{P}' \equiv P' + N'_1$ and $P'_{uc} \rightarrow \hat{P}'_{uc} \equiv P'_{uc} - N'_2$. Once again the situation is the same, apart from a different relative sign in the redefinitions, if the NP is added to P'_{uc} .

We therefore conclude that, regardless of how one adds the NP, it is always possible to cast the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes as in the SM. This indicates that there is technically no clean signal of NP in $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays. The fundamental reason for this is reparametrization invari-

ance [5] and the fact that the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes involve two phases.

Similar results can be seen in $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays. Using the (re)definitions: $P \equiv P_{tc} - \frac{1}{3}P_{EW} + PA_{tc}$ and $P_{uc} \rightarrow P_{uc} + E + PA_{uc}$, the complete SM amplitudes for these decays are

$$\begin{aligned} -\sqrt{2}A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) &= (T+C) e^{i\gamma} + (P_{EW} + P_{EW}^C) e^{-i\beta}, \\ -A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) &= (T+P_{uc}) e^{i\gamma} + (P_{EW}^C + P) e^{-i\beta}, \\ -\sqrt{2}A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0) &= (C-P_{uc}) e^{i\gamma} + (P_{EW} - P) e^{-i\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

It is straightforward to show that if NP enters any of the diagrams above, it can be divided into two pieces as $N'e^{i\phi} = N_1 e^{i\gamma} + N_2 e^{-i\beta}$, and absorbed through redefinitions of the SM diagrams. Hence no clean NP signal is possible in the $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ either. Once again, just as in the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ case, we find that NP introduced in P_{EW} or C modifies P_{EW} and C amplitudes simultaneously. The case for the pairs (T, P_{EW}) and (P, P_{uc}) are similar.

This said, it must be acknowledged that there are, in fact, significant differences between $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ and $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays. Within the SM, the P_{EW} and P_{EW}^C contributions in $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays are expected to be tiny and are hence justifiably ignored. If there is NP, the amplitudes cannot be recast in the SM form if P_{EW} and P_{EW}^C are neglected. In this case, direct CP violation in $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ is a clean signal of NP. Thus, it is only if P_{EW} and P_{EW}^C are kept that one can conclude that no clean NP signal is possible.

Other B decays can be analyzed similarly. The easiest way is to look at the quark-level topologies. $B \rightarrow \pi K$ and $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays are $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}u\bar{u}$ and $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{d}u\bar{u}$, respectively. The analysis of all decays of the form $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{d}u\bar{u}$, $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}u\bar{u}$, $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{d}c\bar{c}$, or $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}c\bar{c}$ is thus identical to those above. If all SM diagrams are kept, any NP effects can be absorbed by redefining the SM diagrams, so that there are no clean signals of NP in such decays.

Decays of the form $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{d}d\bar{d}$, $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}d\bar{d}$, $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{d}s\bar{s}$, or $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}s\bar{s}$ are slightly different because T and C cannot enter (i.e. they are “pure penguin”). For example, consider $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$. The amplitude for this decay is

$$A(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0) = P_{uc} e^{i\gamma} + P e^{-i\beta}, \quad (6)$$

where P and P_{uc} are as defined above except there is no E contribution here. It is easy to see that NP added to any of the diagrams can once again be absorbed by redefinitions of the amplitudes. Thus, there can be no clean signal of NP in $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ decays.

We therefore see that there are *no clean signals of NP* in B decays which receive penguin contributions. This is the first point of this paper. This result was earlier stated in Ref. [6]. However, NP was introduced there only by modifying one of the contributing weak phases. Here the conclusion is more robust as it is obtained when an arbitrary NP amplitude is introduced. The only possible way

to have a signal of NP in modes with penguin contributions is to make an approximation in the SM amplitudes. The approximation must be such that NP-altered amplitudes cannot be recast in the SM form. *The signal of NP so obtained will be reliable, if the approximation is justifiable.*

In comparison, clean signals of NP are possible in the pure tree-level decays $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{u}cd$, $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c}u\bar{d}$, $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{u}c\bar{s}$, and $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c}u\bar{s}$. These decays have only one weak phase and so NP can be detected through measurements of direct CP violation. However, any NP effects are purely tree-level and are therefore much suppressed [7].

In modes with penguin contributions, our observation that NP-modified amplitudes retain the SM form has two additional consequences which we discuss in detail.

It has been speculated that a large electroweak-penguin amplitude resulting from NP could resolve the $K\pi$ puzzle. Several fits to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data [4] seem to indicate that the electroweak-penguin amplitude is indeed large, but they also find that it is difficult to accommodate the data without demanding a larger-than-expected C' amplitude. A priori one would not expect a tree-level amplitude to be substantially affected by NP. However, as we have illustrated, the simultaneous effect of NP on C' and P'_{EW} is not an accident. In fact, a second conclusion that emerges from the above discussion is that *NP always affects diagrammatic amplitudes in pairs*. To be specific, we find that the following pairs of (suitably-redefined) amplitudes are simultaneously affected by NP:

- P'_{EW} and C' (P_{EW} and C),
- P'^C_{EW} and T' (P^C_{EW} and T),
- P' and P'_{uc} (P and P_{uc}).

These pairs of diagrams are topologically equivalent in the sense that if they contribute to any decay mode, they always appear together. Hence it should have been expected that NP must contribute to specific pairs of amplitudes simultaneously. The fact that fits to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data require a large C' may well indicate a contribution of NP to P'_{EW} .

Now, the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ modes have been used to measure the weak phase γ . It is important to examine the effect of NP on this weak-phase measurement. We have shown that all the isospin-related $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes have the same form as in the SM even in the presence of NP. Hence, in principle, the weak phase measured using these modes with or without NP should remain the same. However, a simple counting of the number of theoretical parameters versus the number of independent observables implies that γ cannot be extracted without resorting to some approximations. As noted above, when no approximations are made, NP does not alter the SM form of the amplitudes. However, if some of the diagrammatic amplitudes are neglected, then the NP-modified amplitudes

may not have the SM form. Only when the approximations made are such that the amplitudes with the addition of NP retain the SM form, then the *weak phase measured remains unaltered from its SM value, even in the presence of NP*. This is our third result and it explains why fits to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data [4] often yield γ consistent with the CKM fits [8]. In case the approximations made are such that the amplitudes in the presence of NP cannot be recast in the SM form, the addition of NP will result in adding to the number of theoretical parameters, rendering the weak-phase measurement impossible without further assumptions. If γ is nevertheless measured and is found to differ from the SM value, the deviation may be either due to NP or due to the invalid approximations used. In this sense a discrepancy in the measured value of γ is not necessarily an unambiguous signal of NP.

The $B \rightarrow \pi K$ modes are described by a larger number of parameters than the possible measurements. There can at best be 9 independent observables: the branching ratios and direct CP asymmetries for each of the four decay modes and one time-dependent CP asymmetry for $B_d^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$. Using Eq. (3), we see that there are six diagrammatic amplitudes and two weak phases γ and β , resulting in a total of 13 parameters. The phase β can be taken from the measurement of $\sin 2\beta$ in $B^0(t) \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$: $\sin 2\beta = 0.726 \pm 0.037$ [9], leaving 12 theoretical unknowns. It is hence clear that one needs to make some approximation in order to analyze these modes.

In Ref. [1], the relative sizes of the amplitudes were estimated to be roughly

$$1 : |P'_{tc}|, \quad \mathcal{O}(\bar{\lambda}) : |T'|, |P'_{EW}|, \\ \mathcal{O}(\bar{\lambda}^2) : |C'|, |P'_{uc}|, |P'^C_{EW}|, \quad \mathcal{O}(\bar{\lambda}^3) : |A'|, \quad (7)$$

where $\bar{\lambda} \sim 0.2$. These SM estimates are often used as a guide to neglect diagrammatic amplitudes and reduce the number of parameters.

If one retains only the “large” diagrams (P'_{tc} , T' , P'_{EW}), the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes can be written

$$A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0) \simeq -P'_{tc}, \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) \simeq P'_{tc} + P'_{EW} - T'e^{i\gamma}, \\ A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+) \simeq P'_{tc} - T'e^{i\gamma}, \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0) \simeq -P'_{tc} + P'_{EW}. \quad (8)$$

Using the above approximate form, signals of NP are possible since some of the amplitudes have a well-defined phase and RI is lost. For example, the direct CP asymmetry in $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ vanishes. Similarly, the mixing-induced CP asymmetry in $B^0(t) \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ should be equal to that in $B^0(t) \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ (modulo a sign). Any deviation from these expectations may imply presence of NP. Note, however, that this conclusion would be based on the validity of the approximations made in the above parametrization.

There are other examples where NP signals can be obtained under approximations. The sum rule [10]

$$\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+) + \Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0) \approx 2\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) + 2\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0) . \quad (9)$$

holds approximately in the SM with errors that are quadratic in the subdominant terms (T' , P'_{EW}). The breakdown of this sum rule is a signal of NP.

Another approximate parametrization for the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes considered in literature [11] is

$$\begin{aligned} A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0) &\simeq -P'_{tc} , \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) &\simeq P'_{tc} + P'_{EW} - (T' + C')e^{i\gamma} , \\ A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+) &\simeq P'_{tc} - T'e^{i\gamma} , \\ \sqrt{2}A(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0) &\simeq -P'_{tc} + P'_{EW} - C'e^{i\gamma} . \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

C' is retained even though it is subdominant, as it is claimed that the fit is extremely poor without retaining C' . Leaving aside the merits of such an assumption, we note that in Eq. (10) we have 9 variables and 9 observables. The system of equations can thus be solved to obtain γ and other variables. It is easy to see that if NP contributes to P'_{EW} or C' it can be reabsorbed using RI. This is because P'_{EW} and C' appear simultaneously in the amplitudes. Since the amplitudes have the same form with or without NP the value of γ measured under this approximation *would not differ from the SM value even in the presence of NP*. If a disagreement in the value of γ is found, it must reflect a failure of the assumptions made. In case NP contributes to other topologies it *cannot* be reabsorbed using RI and the value of γ cannot be measured unless further approximations are made.

Given that the pairing of P'_{EW} and C' is the reason for fits to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data finding a value for γ consistent with the SM CKM fits, it is puzzling why fits to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data using Eq. (8) (e.g., Ref. [12]) also result in a value for γ in agreement with the SM. The explanation lies in the large error in the data, due to which the two parametrizations in Eqs. (8) and (10) cannot be distinguished. This argument is vindicated by the fits performed in Ref. [12] when NP is included. If NP is added to P'_{EW} in Eq. (8), it can be recast in the form of Eq. (10) with C' being replaced entirely by a NP contribution and P'_{EW} being redefined. Only NP of this kind (scenario (i) of Ref. [12]) results in the best fits and γ is remarkably consistent with the SM. The point is that the agreement of γ obtained with the SM value does not a priori rule out NP, but rather strengthens the arguments in favor of NP contributing to P'_{EW} .

To summarize, we have made three main points. First, there are no clean signals of new physics (NP) in any B decay which receives penguin contributions. In order to obtain a signal of NP, it is necessary to either have an accurate theoretical estimate of parameters or to make a justifiable approximation. Second, we have noted that

in all decays with penguin contributions, NP always affects diagrammatic amplitudes in pairs. The diagrams P'_{EW} and C' , P'_{EW} and T' , and P' and P'_{uc} (with or without primes) are simultaneously affected by NP. Fits to $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data suggest larger-than-expected P'_{EW} and C' contributions. In view of our observation, the requirement of large C' may be a sign of NP. Finally, we have shown that if NP contributes in such a way that the amplitudes retain the SM form using RI, the weak phase obtained will not be altered due to the presence of NP. This provides a natural explanation of the result that several fits to $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data with varying approximations yield γ in accord with SM. The observation of a large C' and γ consistent with the SM in $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays provide substantial circumstantial evidence in favor of NP.

D.L. thanks F. J. Botella and J. P. Silva for helpful conversations about $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays and reparametrization invariance. D.L. also acknowledges a useful email exchange with M. Gronau and J. Rosner. The work of M.I. and D.L. was financially supported by NSERC of Canada. N.S. thanks the theory group, KEK for their hospitality, where part of this work was done. The work of N.S. was partially supported by the Department of Science and Technology, India.

-
- [1] M. Gronau, O. F. Hernandez, D. London and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 4529 (1994), Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6374 (1995).
 - [2] Particle Data Group Collaboration, S. Eidelman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **592** (2004) 1.
 - [3] A. Datta and D. London, Phys. Lett. B **595**, 453 (2004); A. Datta, M. Imbeault, D. London, V. Page, N. Sinha and R. Sinha, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 096002 (2005). In these references NP strong phases were argued to be negligible. No such assumption is made in the present work.
 - [4] For example, see S. Baek, JHEP **0607**, 025 (2006), and references therein.
 - [5] F. J. Botella and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 094008 (2005); S. Baek, F. J. Botella, D. London and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 036004 (2005).
 - [6] D. London, N. Sinha and R. Sinha, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 074020 (1999).
 - [7] C. Dib, D. London and Y. Nir, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **6**, 1253 (1991).
 - [8] The CKMfitter group, http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/ckm_results_beauty2006.html.
 - [9] BELLE Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, hep-ex/0408111; BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, hep-ex/0408127.
 - [10] H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Lett. B **445**, 403 (1999); M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 113002 (1999).
 - [11] C. S. Kim, S. Oh and C. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 074005 (2005).
 - [12] S. Baek, P. Hamel, D. London, A. Datta and D. A. Suprun, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 057502 (2005).